Urellia abstersa, Lw. Down to Mesilla Valley; also in Cuba, etc.

* *Urellia mevarna*, Walk. S. E. to Florida.

Sepsis violacea, Meig. Down to Mesilla Valley.

* *Piophila casei*, L. N. to Alaska. It would seem that this insect must be native in America.

* *Scatella stagnalis*, Fall. N. to Alaska.

* *Oscinis carbonaria*, Lw. N. to Alaska.

* *Meromyza americana* Fitch. Also at Beulah, N. M.

* *Borborus equinus*, Fall. Also European.

* *Borborus geniculatus*, Macq.

LEPIDOPTERA.

The following species, obtained on the top of Las Vegas range at the end of June, 1901, have been kindly identified by Dr. H. G. Dyar.

Anarta melanopa, Thunb. Also Labrador, etc.

Drasteria erechtea, Cram.

Chorizagrotis agrestis, Grote.

Choreutis occidentella, Dyar. Also found in Alaska.

Platyptilia cosmodactyla, Hbn. This is the species referred to in PSYCHE, Nov., 1901, p. 272. Extends to Alaska and Europe.

Pyrausta generosa, G. & R. (?)

HYMENOPTERA, MYRMICIDAE.

The following ants were taken on the top of the Las Vegas range at the end of June, 1901, and have been kindly determined by Prof. W. M. Wheeler.

Myrmica brevinodis, Emery. Worker. "Smaller and darker than those from New England."

Leptothorax canadensis, Provancher. worker and dealated ♀. Does not differ from specimens which Prof. Wheeler has from Wis., Pa., and Conn.

Both of these species are new to the fauna of New Mexico.*

CEPHALIC MORPHOLOGY. Comstock and Kochi have lately given us an important paper (Amer. Nat., 1902, vol. 36, p. 13–45, 29 figs.) upon the morphology of the insect head, and the cephalic sclerites at length assume a deeper significance and a new interest.

In this paper, the view that the head consists of seven segments is adopted and ably supported. The areas of the skull are reviewed and several sclerites hitherto disregarded are described and aptly named.

The morphology of the thoracic segments is discussed so far as is necessary to determine the structure of a typical segment, as the basis for an interpretation of the head, and then the cephalic sclerites are homologized with the thoracic ones, and the endoskeleton of the head with that of the thorax.

The presentation of the subject is logical and clear. The argument rests, of course, upon the assumption that homologies between the cephalic and the thoracic sclerites exist. If, however, the differentiation of the thoracic sclerites has been only an incidental mechanical result of strains, due to the

* I will take this opportunity to record the following ants, also new to New Mexico, kindly determined by Prof. Wheeler: — *Camponotus maculatus vicinus*, Mayr, Trout Spring, Gallinas Cañon (Transition Zone); *Formica sanguinea rubicunda*, Em., Trout Spring; *Liometopum microcephalum occidentale*, Emery, Romeroville (Upper Sonoran Zone); *Eciton californicum*, Mayr, Las Vegas; *Stenamma fulvum aquia*, Buckl. Trout Spring; *Brachymyrmex heeri depilis*, Em., Trout Spring; *Cremastogaster punctulata*, Em., Las Vegas and Las Vegas Hot Springs; *C. lineolata*, subsp. *coarctata* var. *mormonum*, Em., Romeroville.—T. D. A. C.

wing muscles (and this view has much to support it), then no close agreement of cephalic and thoracic sclerites may be expected. Granting the assumption, however, the arguments are impressive.

These authors have been the first to make any extensive examination of the skull in the light of embryology, and their creditable efforts will pave the way toward the true conception of the morphology of the skull.

ANOTHER NOTE ON DELTOCEPHALUS MELSHEIMERII.

BY C. F. BAKER, STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIF.

Since there can be no more important work in taxonomy than the accurate determination of types, I feel inclined to add still another note to the discussion concerning this species. Mr. Gillette's voluminous remarks in Vol. 9, No. 299 of this Journal are both interesting and important. But he meets the old objections by the discussion of new propositions and leaves wholly out of consideration that point on which my whole argument was based. Both *minimus* and *affinis* have been well described; further argument as to their distinctness does not clear up our difficulty.

As it appears to me, the whole question is this: Where is the type of *Melsheimerii*? Some of Fitch's specimens are in Albany, some in the Nat'l Museum. In each place is a "type" of this species. It becomes a question as to which specimens the species was based on.

At the time I discussed the matter in print the point was made that the size of the species as given in the original description agreed with the Natl. Museum type and precluded the possibility of its being *affinis*. My series of *affinis* contained a lot of specimens from all parts of the country and I could not find a true "Melsheimerii" in the lot. Mr. Gillette's study is very incomplete because it does not also include a report on the Natl. Museum "type." His failure to do this leaves the matter standing in essentially the same light as before the publication of his article. The comparison of the two types — the vital point in the whole discussion has yet to be made.

For the same reasons Mr. Gillette's remarks as to Chlorotettix are wholly invalidated. I hope he will give us a supplementary report on the really essential points at issue, with the necessary evidence in hand and set the matter finally and forever at rest.